

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: @@@@ @@, @@@@  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

| FULL-SIZED PROJECT        | LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND  |
|---------------------------|---|
| GEF PROJECT ID:           | 8035  |
| PROJECT DURATION:         | 5   |
| COUNTRIES:                | Uganda  |
| PROJECT TITLE:            | Reducing the Climate Change Vulnerability of Local Communities in Uganda through EbA in Forest and Wetland Ecosystems |
| GEF AGENCIES:             | UNEP  |
| OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: | Ministry of Water and Environment   |
| GEF FOCAL AREA:           | Climate Change  |

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNEP proposal "Reducing the climate change vulnerability of local communities in Uganda through EbA in forest and wetland ecosystems". The proposed project includes a wide range of actions to build capacity to integrate EbA into management plans: to reduce the vulnerability of adjacent communities to climate change, to establish alternative livelihoods, to halt current deforestation and ecosystem degradation, to increase the adaptive capacity of communities, and to improve and disseminate knowledge about EbA broadly across social groups. Overall, STAP finds that the PIF is scientifically and technically sound.

To enhance the overall project design, STAP would like to offer the following recommendations:  
[Curiously, page numbering starts with 0 on what is actually page 10 and restarts with 0 on what is actually page 20. Page numbers below refer to the actual page numbers.]

1. The key concern is that the current trends of fast deforestation, (wet)land conversion, and ecosystem degradation are likely to cause much more damage in the next few years than climate change might cause over the next few decades. The baseline scenario (p. 5) mentions initiatives to address these problems but how extensive and how successful are they? It is surely important to integrate climate change and EbA into these efforts but an important precondition for success will be to stop degradation by addressing its drivers, because in the absence of well-established and proven alternative livelihoods (credible to related communities) continued destructive practices jeopardize the results of restoration and EbA efforts.

2. STAP welcomes the recognition that the overall evidence-base for EbA remains weak, and the attempt to alleviate this in the project through comprehensive knowledge management initiatives.

3. STAP welcomes the efforts made to present multiple sources of scientific and other references to support the statements made in the PIF.
4. Climate change scenarios are cited (p. 4) which project an increase in mean temperatures in Uganda between 0.7Å°C and 1.5Å°C by 2020 – it would be important to know relative to which baseline period, for which scenario, and for which models? Moreover, it would be important to look beyond 2020, to the time period of expected benefits from the proposed interventions.
5. Alternative scenario (p. 7): tailoring alternative livelihood plans to local conditions is an excellent idea, but it might be worth involving representatives of local communities (to clarify their perceptions, values, preferences, etc. about the alternatives) in making these plans.
6. The selected districts currently suffering rapid degradation (p. 11) will be challenging to work in, but if successful, they will demonstrate the effectiveness of procedures to follow elsewhere.
7. A.4.Risks (pp. 16-17): Assessments of potential risks and the indications of countermeasures are appropriate, but should consider adding one more, at least medium level economic risks - failure to establish alternative livelihoods which causes the continuation of destructive practices and further ecosystem degradation. Developing countermeasures to this risk would be important. It may also be valuable to take into account environmental risks not targeted by the project, including those posed by climate change, to the sustainability of the project.
8. It is not clear why the excellent list of coordination and plans was moved to Appendix 2 on p. 26 instead including it after the opening paragraph under A.5.Coordination on p. 17. Regardless of the final placement of this list, two items need to be updated: the Strengthening Sustainable Environment – and the Economic assessment – project were completed in 2014 and 2015, respectively, so please change verb tenses, and cite actual results/outcomes to which the present GEF LDCF activities will link.
9. The detailed list of Indicative activities in Appendix 1 (pp. 21-25) deserves special praise because it adds a lot of useful content to the list of outcomes and outputs explained in sections A.1.3 and A.1.4.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i>                                 | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>   |
|---|---|
| <b>1. Concur</b>  | In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.  |
| <b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b> | <p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.<br/> (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>                |
| <b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b> | <p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p> |
|--|---|